

Topological Quantization and Degeneracy in Josephson-Junction Arrays

M.Y. Choi

Department of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea

J. Choi

Department of Physics, Keimyung University, Taegu 704-701, Korea

We consider the conductivity quantization in two-dimensional arrays of mesoscopic Josephson junctions, and examine the associated degeneracy in various regimes of the system. The filling factor of the system may be controlled by the gate voltage as well as the magnetic field, and its appropriate values for quantization is obtained by employing the Jain hierarchy scheme both in the charge description and in the vortex description. The duality between the two descriptions then suggests the possibility that the system undergoes a change in degeneracy while the quantized conductivity remains fixed.

PACS numbers: 74.50.+r, 74.25.Fy, 67.40.Db, 67.40.-w

During past decades two-dimensional arrays of superconducting grains, weakly coupled by Josephson junctions, have been studied extensively.¹ In particular recent advances in fabrication techniques make it possible to control the physical parameters of the arrays, providing a convenient model system for the study of charge and vortex configuration and dynamics. When the dimensions of the superconducting grains and the capacitances involved are small, the associated charging energy is non-negligible and quantum dynamics comes into play at the macroscopic level.² In such an array of ultra-small junctions, frustration can be introduced not only by applying magnetic fields but also by inducing external charges; these control the numbers of vortices and charges (Cooper pairs), leading to interesting dynamic responses.³ In appropriate regimes the Hall conductivity as well as the dc component of the voltage or of the current may be quantized, and the possibility of the corresponding quantum Hall effect⁴ as well as the giant Shapiro steps and giant inverse Shapiro steps⁵ has been pointed out.

This work examines such conductivity quantization in various regimes of the system, with regard to the associated degeneracy. We thus consider a Josephson-junction array with the junction capacitance between nearest-neighbor grains dominant over the self-capacitance of each grain; the system is characterized by the charge-vortex duality, which is manifested by transforming charge variables into vortex variables. Here in the presence of both the charging energy and the Josephson coupling energy, charges or vortices may form incompressible quantum liquids and display quantization of the Hall conductivity at appropriate values of the filling factor, which may be controlled by the gate voltage as well as the magnetic field.⁶ We employ the Jain hierarchy scheme⁷ to obtain the quantization values of the filling factor both in the charge description and in the vortex description. The duality between the two descriptions then suggests that the system may undergo a change in degeneracy while

the quantized conductivity remains fixed.

We begin with an $L \times L$ square array ($L^2 \equiv N$) with the Josephson coupling E_J and the charging energy $E_C \equiv e^2/2C$, in the limit that the self-capacitance C_0 is negligibly small compared with the junction capacitance C . The system in the uniform transverse magnetic field $\mathbf{B} \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = 4E_C \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} (n_{\mathbf{r}} - f_c) G_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} (n_{\mathbf{r}'} - f_c) - E_J \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' \rangle} \cos(\phi_{\mathbf{r}} - \phi_{\mathbf{r}'} - A_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'}), \quad (1)$$

where the (excess) Cooper pair number $n_{\mathbf{r}}$ at site $\mathbf{r}$ is conjugate to the phase $\phi_{\mathbf{r}}$ and $G_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'}$ is the lattice Green's function. The (uniform) charge frustration f_c is related to the externally induced charge Q on each grain via $f_c \equiv Q/2e$, whereas the plaquette sum of the bond angle $A_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} \equiv (2\pi/\Phi_0) \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{r}'} \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$ gives the the number of the flux quantum $\Phi_0 \equiv 2\pi\hbar c/2e$ or the (uniform) magnetic frustration f_v according to $\sum_p A_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} = -2\pi f_v$. Here the system is described in terms of charge variables; in this description the charges (Cooper pairs) interact via the 2D Coulomb potential of strength E_C while the Josephson coupling E_J provides the kinetic energy for them.

When the charging energy is smaller than the Josephson coupling energy, it is convenient to use the dual description by means of the vortex Hamiltonian⁸

$$H = 2\pi E_J \sum_{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'} (n_{\mathbf{R}}^v - f_v) G_{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'} (n_{\mathbf{R}'}^v - f_v) - \frac{2}{\pi^2} E_C \sum_{\langle \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}' \rangle} \cos(\phi_{\mathbf{R}}^v - \phi_{\mathbf{R}'}^v - A_{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'}^v), \quad (2)$$

where the vortices, defined on dual lattice sites $\mathbf{R}$, are taken for quantum mechanical particles. Namely, the vortex charge $n_{\mathbf{R}}^v$ and the vortex phase $\phi_{\mathbf{R}}^v$ are conjugate to each other. The vortex bond angle $A_{\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'}^v$ has

been defined in such a way that its plaquette sum (on the dual lattice) gives the induced charge on the enclosed grain or charge frustration, $\sum_p A_{\mathbf{R},\mathbf{R}'}^v = -2\pi f_c$. The vortex bond angle may also be expressed as the line integral of the vortex vector potential $\mathbf{A}_v$: $A_{\mathbf{R},\mathbf{R}'}^v = (2\pi/2e) \int_{\mathbf{R}}^{\mathbf{R}'} \mathbf{A}_v \cdot d\mathbf{l}$, where the corresponding vortex magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_v \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_v$ is simply the induced surface charge density ρ , so that the flux through a grain is simply the total induced charge on that grain, $\int \mathbf{B}_v \cdot d\mathbf{a} = Q$. In this vortex Hamiltonian, the roles of the charging energy and the Josephson energy are reversed: The latter describes interactions between vortices whereas the former provides kinetic energy. The resulting charge-vortex duality between Eqs. (1) and (2) has been shown to give interesting consequences such as universal conductivity,⁹ persistent current and voltage,¹⁰ and giant Shapiro steps and inverse steps in response to applied ac currents.⁵

In the absence of the Josephson coupling ($E_J = 0$), the ground state of the system, determined by the first term of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1), forms an insulating charge lattice. When $f_c = p/q$ with p and q relatively prime, the charge lattice has the $q \times q$ structure, in general with q -fold degeneracy. On the other hand, in the opposite case that the charging energy is absent ($E_C = 0$), the ground state is determined by the second term of Hamiltonian (2), forming an $s \times s$ vortex lattice for $f_v = r/s$ (again with relatively prime r and s). Thus obtained is a superconducting state with s -fold degeneracy. Obviously, these degeneracy factors may also be obtained from the dual descriptions. For example, in the latter case of $E_C = 0$, Eq. (1) reduces to the Hamiltonian for a (tight-binding) charged particle in a magnetic field, which is well known to display s -fold degenerate energy spectra.¹¹

In the presence of both charging energy and Josephson energy, the latter provides kinetic energy of charges or the former provides that of vortices, which tends to destroy the charge or vortex lattice structure. Unlike in a continuum system,¹² vortices in the array system considered here are generally accepted as rather well-defined point-like objects with finite effective mass.^{13,14} In particular, vortices as well as charges have been argued to be bosons, possessing hard cores in the appropriate regimes.⁴ Accordingly, when the two energies are comparable to each other, we have strongly interacting particles (charges or vortices), which have been suggested to form a quantum liquid in the ground state. In this case it is convenient to write the Hamiltonian (1) or (2) in the second quantized representation:

$$H = t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} e^{-iA_{ij}} b_i^\dagger b_j + u \sum_{i,j} (n_i - f) G_{ij} (n_j - f), \quad (3)$$

where $b_i^\dagger$ and b_i are the boson (charge or vortex) creation and annihilation operators at (original or dual) lattice site i , respectively, $n_i \equiv b_i^\dagger b_i$ is the number operator, A_{ij} is the charge or vortex bond angle, and f describes

charge or magnetic frustration. We here consider the case of large u such that bosons are well defined with small fluctuations, possessing hard cores ($n_i = 0, 1$). This corresponds to the regime of large E_C in the charge description, where t and u are proportional to E_J and E_C , respectively; these roles of E_C and E_J are reversed in the vortex description.

Equation (3) describes a two-dimensional system of fN bosons, i.e., $N_c = f_c N$ Cooper pairs or $N_v = f_v N$ vortices, each of charge $2e$ or Φ_0 , in a uniform magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ or $\mathbf{B}_v$. Here each vortex carries one magnetic flux quantum Φ_0 or each charge one vortex magnetic flux quantum $2e$. Thus we have N_c particles together with N_v flux quanta or vice versa, leading to the charge or vortex filling factor $\nu_c \equiv N_c/N_v = f_c/f_v$ and $\nu_v \equiv N_v/N_c = \nu_c^{-1}$. The usual (charge) Hall conductivity thus reads

$$\sigma_H = \nu_c \frac{(2e)^2}{h}, \quad (4)$$

whereas the vortex Hall conductivity, given by the inverse

$$\sigma_H^v = \nu_v \frac{\Phi_0^2}{h} = \frac{c^2}{\sigma_H}, \quad (5)$$

simply corresponds to the Hall resistivity.

Via the Jordan-Wigner transformation, the boson system described by the Hamiltonian (3) can be mapped into a fermion system with an additional gauge field, which is possible owing to the hard-core condition.¹⁵ Namely, we attach α flux quanta to each boson, where α is an odd integer, and transform the boson into a fermion. This results in N_c fermions (charges) with the effective number of flux quanta given by $N_{\phi,eff}^c = |N_v - \alpha N_c|$ or N_v fermions (vortices) with $N_{\phi,eff}^v = |N_c - \alpha N_v|$ flux quanta, and such a system of interacting fermions in a magnetic field is expected to form an incompressible quantum fluid for an appropriate filling factor. In the simple case the ground state is described by the Laughlin wave function

$$\Psi = \prod_{i < j}^{fN} |z_i - z_j|^\alpha (z_i - z_j)^m \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4\ell^2} \sum_i^{fN} |z_i|^2 \right] \quad (6)$$

where z_i represents the complex coordinate of the i th particle (Cooper pair or vortex) and $\ell \equiv \sqrt{\hbar c / 2eB}$ or $\sqrt{\hbar c / \Phi_0 B_v}$ is the magnetic length. Here the odd integer m is related to the filling factor via $\nu = (m + \alpha)^{-1}$, giving the fractional quantization of the Hall conductivity at even-denominator filling factors.

According to the topological argument,¹⁶ fractional quantization associated with the filling factor $1/2k$ requires that the ground-state wave function should be multi-valued on a torus, possessing $2k$ components.¹⁷ Here it is of interest to note that such fractional quantization of the vortex Hall conductivity corresponds to the integer quantization of the charge Hall conductivity. In particular the relation between the two filling factors, $\nu_c = \nu_v^{-1}$, suggests the possibility of different topological degeneracy depending on the description, in terms of

either charges or vortices. To examine such possibility, we adopt the Jain hierarchy⁷ to obtain appropriate filling factors for quantization. With $m-1$ flux quanta attached to each fermion, the remaining flux quanta gives the net number $N_{\phi,net}^{c,v} = N_{\phi,eff}^{c,v} - (m-1)N_{c,v}$. Note that attaching $m-1$ flux quanta to a fermion corresponds to attaching $\alpha+m-1 \equiv (2k-1)$ flux quanta to the boson (original charge or vortex), thus transforming it into a fermion. For charges, this leads to $N_{\phi,net}^c/N = f_v - (\alpha+m-1)f_c$ for $\alpha f_c < f_v$ and $N_{\phi,net}^c/N = (\alpha-m+1)f_c - f_v$ for $\alpha f_c > f_v$; for vortices, the roles of f_c and f_v are reversed. The net filling factor is then given by

$$\nu_{c,v}^{(net)} \equiv \frac{N_{c,v}}{N_{\phi,net}^{c,v}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\nu_{c,v}}{1 - (\alpha+m-1)\nu_{c,v}}, & \alpha f_{c,v} < f_{v,c} \\ \frac{\nu_{c,v}}{(\alpha-m+1)\nu_{c,v} - 1}, & \alpha f_{c,v} > f_{v,c} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\nu_{c,v} \equiv f_{c,v}/f_{v,c}$ is the bare filling factor for charges or vortices. To obtain quantization, we should have an integer number of filled Landau levels, i.e., $\nu^{(net)} = n$. With this condition, Eq. (7) yields the values of the filling factors appropriate for quantization, which, for both charges and vortices, obtain the form

$$\nu = \frac{1}{(2k-1) \pm \frac{1}{n}} \quad (8)$$

with $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. When only the lowest Landau level is filled ($n = 1$), the above result reduces to $\nu = 1/2k$, reproducing the values of the Laughlin state, as expected. On the other hand, in case that all the flux quanta are attached ($n \rightarrow \infty$), we have $\nu = 1/(2k-1)$, implying that odd-denominator values are also possible.

In the charge description, relevant for the case of sufficiently large E_C , we have fractional quantization of the Hall conductivity at $\nu_c = (2k-1 \pm 1/n)^{-1}$. In the opposite case that E_J is sufficiently larger than E_C , the vortex description is applicable, yielding quantization (of the charge Hall conductivity) at $\nu_c = (2k-1 \pm 1/n)$. In this regime, however, the topological character is determined by the vortex configuration, and may not be the same as that appearing by the charge configuration. As an example, we consider the case $f_c = 1/2$ and $f_v = 1/3$, leading to the filling factors $\nu_c = 3/2$ and $\nu_v = 2/3$. In the charge description, Eq. (8) with $k = 1$ and $n = 3$ gives $\nu_c = 3/2$, implying (charge) Hall conductivity quantization at this value, with two-fold topological degeneracy. Similarly, the value $\nu_v = 2/3$ can be obtained from Eq. (8) with $k = 1$ and $n = 2$, thus suggesting quantization of the vortex Hall conductivity at $\nu_v = 2/3$, with three-fold degeneracy. Via Eq. (5), this corresponds to quantization of the charge Hall conductivity at $\nu_c = 3/2$. Accordingly, the quantization (of the charge Hall conductivity) remains the same in the two regimes, but the topological degeneracy is apparently different.

Generalizing the above, we consider a system with given values of f_c and f_v , such that the quantized filling factors are given by $\nu_c = f_c/f_v = p/q$ and $\nu_v = \nu_c^{-1} = q/p$ with p and q relatively prime. When E_J/E_C is sufficiently small, the charge description is appropriate and gives q -fold degeneracy. For sufficiently large E_J/E_C , on the other hand, we have p -fold degeneracy from the vortex description. This is reminiscent of the problem of a charged particle in a periodic (lattice) potential under a magnetic field:¹⁸ In the tight-binding limit, where the potential is sufficiently strong compared with the kinetic energy, the system is described by Harper's equation with the frustration parameter f , displaying s -fold degeneracy. (Here $f = r/s$ is again the flux per plaquette in units of the flux quantum.) In the opposite limit of weak potential, the system is still described by Harper's equation, manifesting duality, but f is replaced by f^{-1} , leading to r -fold degeneracy. Since the Josephson coupling corresponds to the kinetic energy of charges, the duality between the two regimes in the array is indeed analogous to that in Harper's equation. In the regime $E_J/E_C \ll 1$, the ground state of the system should be an insulator; for $E_J/E_C \gg 1$ it should be a superconductor. The system is thus expected to undergo a phase transition between the insulating state and the superconducting one as E_J/E_C is varied, suggesting the duality present between the two states. Assuming a single transition, we expect the system to be self-dual at the critical value $(E_J/E_C)_c$, which depends upon the frustration parameters f_c and f_v . It then follows that the system with quantization at $\nu_c = p/q$ possesses q -fold degeneracy for $E_J/E_C < (E_J/E_C)_c$ and p -fold one for $E_J/E_C > (E_J/E_C)_c$.

In summary, we have considered the possibility of conductivity quantization in a two-dimensional array of Josephson junctions, and examined the associated degeneracy in various regimes of the system. In the presence of both the charging energy and the Josephson coupling energy, charges or vortices may form incompressible quantum liquids and display quantization of the Hall conductivity at appropriate values of the filling factor, which may be controlled by the gate voltage as well as the magnetic field. Adopting the Jain hierarchy scheme, we have obtained the quantization values of the filling factor both in the charge description and in the vortex description. The duality between the two descriptions has then been shown to suggest the interesting possibility that the degeneracy of the system can change while the quantized conductivity remains fixed.

MYC thanks D.J. Thouless for the hospitality during his stay at University of Washington, where this work was performed. JC thanks D. Belitz for the hospitality during his stay at University of Oregon. This work was supported in part by the Ministry of Education through the BK21 Program and by the National Science Foundation Grant DMR-9815932.

-
- ¹ For a list of references, see, e.g., *Proceedings of the 2nd CTP workshop on Statistical Physics: KT Transition and Superconducting Arrays*, edited by D. Kim, J.S. Chung, and M.Y. Choi (Min-Eum Sa, Seoul, 1993); *Macroscopic Quantum Phenomena and Coherence in Superconducting Networks*, edited by C. Giovannella and M. Tinkham (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995); Physica B **222** 253–406 (1996).
- ² G. Schön and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rep. **198**, 237 (1990).
- ³ R. Fazio and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 5307 (1991); B.J. van Wees, *ibid.* **44**, 2264 (1991).
- ⁴ M.Y. Choi, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 10088 (1994); A. Stern, *ibid.* **50**, 10092 (1994); A.A. Odintsov and Y.V. Nazarov, *ibid.* **51**, 1133 (1995).
- ⁵ M. Kvale and S.E. Hebboul, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 3720 (1991); M.Y. Choi, *ibid.* **46**, 564 (1992); **50**, 13875 (1994).
- ⁶ The limitations and experimental observability have been discussed in Ref. 4. Here we assume the validity of this proposal, and examine the consequence of applying the Jain hierarchy.
- ⁷ J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989); Phys. Rev. B **41**, 7663 (1990). See also M.Y. Choi, C. Lee, and J. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1489 (1992).
- ⁸ Although the additional spin-wave excitations make the duality inexact, in the limit $C_0 \ll C$ the duality-breaking term does not lead to low-energy excitations; see Ref.³ and R. Fazio, A. van Otterlo, and G. Schön, Europhys. Lett. **25**, 453 (1994). Accordingly, the low-temperature properties are not expected to change qualitatively by the duality-breaking term. In particular, the spin-wave part does not depend on the frustration parameter, thus not affect degeneracy and topological properties, which are our concern here.
- ⁹ M.P.A. Fisher, G. Grinstein, and S.M. Grivin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 587 (1990); M.-C. Cha, et al., Phys. Rev. B **44**, 6883 (1991).

- ¹⁰ B.J. van Wees, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 255 (1990); T.P. Orlando and K.A. Delin, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 8717 (1991); M.Y. Choi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2987 (1993).
- ¹¹ S. Ostlund and R. Pandit, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 1394 (1984); M.Y. Choi and S. Doniach, *ibid.* **31**, 4516 (1985).
- ¹² For the controversy in continuum systems, see J.-M. Duan and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1216 (1992); Q. Niu, P. Ao, and D. J. Thouless, *ibid.* **72**, 1706 (1994); **75**, 975 (1995); J.-M. Duan, *ibid.* **75**, 974 (1995). For the transverse force on a vortex, see D. J. Thouless, P. Ao, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3758 (1996); M. R. Geller, C. Wexler, and D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. B **57**, R8119 (1998). G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4687 (1996); E. B. Sonin, *ibid.* **81**, 4276 (1998).
- ¹³ U. Eckern and A. Schmid, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 6441 (1989).
- ¹⁴ The lattice structure in the array leads to a vortex pinning potential in the continuum description of vortex dynamics. See C.J. Lobb, D.W. Abraham, and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 150 (1983); M. Yoon, M.Y. Choi, and B.J. Kim, *ibid.* **61**, 3263 (2000). The effects of such a pinning potential are usually taken into account by changing the vortex mass from the bare value to the effective one, as discussed in Ref. 13; R. Fazio, A. van Otterlo, G. Schön, H.S.J. van der Zant, and J.E. Mooij, Helv. Phys. Acta **65**, 228 (1992), and references therein. This does not alter the remaining argument, based on topological properties and the Jain hierarchy.
- ¹⁵ E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 322 (1989).
- ¹⁶ D.J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M.P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 405 (1982); Q. Niu, D.J. Thouless, and Y.S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 3372 (1985).
- ¹⁷ D.J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 12034 (1989); D.J. Thouless and Y. Gefen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 806 (1991).
- ¹⁸ D.R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 2239 (1976); J.B. Sokoloff, Phys. Rep. **126**, 189 (1985); D.J. Thouless, in *The Quantum Hall Effect*, edited by R.E. Prange and S.M. Girvin (Springer, New York, 1990); M.Y. Choi, in *Discrete Phenomena in Mathematics and Physics*, edited by D.P. Chi (Pure Math. Res. Asso., Seoul, 1991).